

network plan memo Att A, table 2b question

Katherine Hoag

to:

Meredith Kurpius

05/24/2012 03:02 PM

Cc:

Elfego Felix, Gwen Yoshimura, MichaelA Flagg

Hide Details

From: Katherine Hoag/R9/USEPA/US

To: Meredith Kurpius/R9/USEPA/US@EPA,

Cc: Elfego Felix/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Gwen Yoshimura/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, MichaelA

Flagg/R9/USEPA/US@EPA

Hi Meredith -

That's fine - I think this was the idea of one of Bay Area's comments as well.

I would just say 'minimum SLAMS required' since i think that's the language we used in table 2a. I don't think the intention in any of these tables is to list a DV from a non-fem monitor - rather the DV of the MSA (since 4.7.2 points to table D-5).

On a not-really-related sidenote:

One interesting thing that came up yesterday when Michael and I were talking is that it is clear that the min # is based on MSA, but it is not clear for some things if the DV to be used is the highest in the MSA, or the DV for the nonattainment area. For min # it makes sense for it to be the highest DV in the MSA - for sampling frequency it seemed less clear. Just to make it interesting - the network modification regs that deal with comparing monitors use county as the "area" (not MSA, CBSA nor nonattainment area).

Kate

Katherine Hoag, Ph.D.

U.S. EPA, Region 9

Air Quality Analysis Office (AIR-7)

75 Hawthorne Street

San Francisco, CA 94105

Hoag.Katherine@epa.gov

(415) 972-3970

-----Meredith Kurpius/R9/USEPA/US wrote: -----

To: Katherine Hoag/R9/USEPA/US@EPA

From: Meredith Kurpius/R9/USEPA/US

Date: 05/24/2012 02:41PM

Cc: Gwen Yoshimura/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, MichaelA Flagg/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Elfego Felix/R9/USEPA/US@EPA

Subject: network plan memo Att A, table 2b question

Hi Kate,

I just had a call with Karen, Gayle, and Pheng about the CARB network plan. The big surprise was that they said that the memo was very useful and are implementing as much as they can this year! They had one question that I need to pass along to you. Table 2b of Attachment 1 is the table for minimum monitoring requirements for continuous PM2.5. based on App. D 4.7.2 is that they have to be 1/2 the minimum required sites, etc. So once Table 2a is filled out, there is no need for pop or DV for DV, right? CARB would rather not put DVs down for non-FEM/FRM instruments. Or did we mean that they should put the info from table 2a? It seems to me that

Table 2b could be modified to replace pop and DV with "# FRM/FEM's required" and then the number of continuous would just be calculated from that. Let me know if I'm getting this right. Thanks!

-Meredith

[illegible]

Meredith Kurpius, PhD
Air Quality Analysis Office
Air Division, US EPA
75 Hawthorne St., AIR-7
San Francisco, CA 94105
415-947-4534 (p)
415-947-3579 (f)

 Katherine Hoag---05/24/2012 01:13:40 PM---I'm WAHing from now until 5:15 or so on some AQS data pulls for AIR-2 requests, more analysis for Tu

From: Katherine Hoag/R9/USEPA/US
To: Matthew Lakin/R9/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Meredith Kurpius/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, MichaelA Flagg/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Elfego Felix/R9/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 05/24/2012 01:13 PM
Subject: WAH this afternoon

I'm WAHing from now until 5:15 or so on some AQS data pulls for AIR-2 requests, more analysis for Tuesdays PM2.5 sampling frequency call and responding to some emails. If anyone needs me I can be reached at 415-785-4781.

Kate

Katherine Hoag, Ph.D.
U.S. EPA, Region 9
Air Quality Analysis Office (AIR-7)
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105
Hoag.Katherine@epa.gov
(415) 972-3970



Some thoughts on the new Site Description template
David Shina to: Elfego Felix

05/20/2012 08:23 AM

Elfego,

In the attachment, you will find our thoughts on the new Site Description template.

***** ATTACHMENT NOT
DELIVERED *****

This Email message contained an attachment
named
image001.jpg
which may be a computer program. This
attached computer program could
contain a computer virus which could cause
harm to EPA's computers,
network, and data. The attachment has been
deleted.

This was done to limit the distribution of
computer viruses introduced
into the EPA network. EPA is deleting all
computer program attachments
sent from the Internet into the agency via
Email.

If the message sender is known and the
attachment was legitimate, you
should contact the sender and request that
they rename the file name
extension and resend the Email with the
renamed attachment. After
receiving the revised Email, containing the
renamed attachment, you can
rename the file extension to its correct
name.

For further information, please contact the
EPA Call Center at
(866) 411-4EPA (4372). The TDD number is
(866) 489-4900.

***** ATTACHMENT NOT

DELIVERED *****



Site Desc Update.docx

Elfego,

We were updating our Network Plan, using the template we recently received from Region IX, and we noticed several apparent redundancies. We just thought we would offer our suggestions and you could use them as you see fit. Take them for what it is worth, as just observations to help the reader more easily read a complex table. We know it is too late to address any changes this year, but maybe next year they can be addressed. We've listed them below:

One

Basic monitoring objective	NAAQS comparison
Is it suitable for comparison against the annual PM _{2.5} ?	

Under the description for Basic monitoring objective it states "NAAQS comparison", so it is redundant to have another row that asks, "Is it suitable for comparison against the annual PM_{2.5} (yes/no)?" because if it is not suitable, you cannot list "NAAQS comparison" in the Basic monitoring objective anyway.

Two

Frequency of flow rate verification for sequential PM samplers	
Frequency of flow rate verification for continuous PM samplers	
Frequency of one-point QC check for gaseous instruments	

Frequency of flow rate verification for <type of sampler> PM sampler is an unnecessary breakdown. All the equipment gets a separate column anyway, so the continuous and sequential samplers already are separated. You could answer the frequency question simply with just one row, "Frequency of flow rate verification for PM sampler(s)". You have one column for the continuous sampler and answer accordingly and the same for the sequential in its column.

If you want to eliminate yet another row, you can add the "Frequency of one-point QC check for the gaseous instruments" into the same argument. The flow rate verification is a QC check. You could say, "Frequency of QC check⁸". And, footnote "8" would say, flow rate verification for PM samplers and one-point check for gaseous instruments. Weekly, biweekly, monthly, etc. Once again, each piece of equipment gets its own column anyway, so having three rows for the same QC question, just seems a waste of space and it is harder to read with a batch of "N/A's" in your vision.

Three

Last annual performance evaluation for gaseous instruments	
Last two semi-annual flow rate audits for PM samplers	

These two rows are both audits, just stated differently. You could say, “Audit of FRM and FEM instrumentation⁹” (or something like that). And, footnote “9” would say, “Annual for gaseous instruments and semi-annual for PM samplers”.

Thanks, as always, for the lending of your “ear” Elfego. We don’t know the process involved for changing these types of items, so we don’t know if it is easy, difficult, or involved. Also, given all the technical changes that are happening, these items are trivial in the big scheme of things. We just thought we could lighten the burden of the reader of these reports.

Re: Annual Plan - memo and Atchmnts - suggestions

Matthew Lakin

to:

Kurt Malone

05/14/2012 06:08 AM

Cc:

Elfego Felix

Hide Details

From: Matthew Lakin/R9/USEPA/US

To: Kurt Malone <kmalone@baaqmd.gov>

Cc: Elfego Felix/R9/USEPA/US@EPA

History: This message has been forwarded.

It's very helpful to receive feedback, Kurt, so thanks. I'll share the information with Elfego and our team who wrote those parts of the memo.

Thanks,

Matt

Matthew Lakin, Ph.D.

Manager, Air Quality Analysis Office, US EPA Region 9

75 Hawthorne Street (AIR-7), San Francisco, CA 94105

P: 415-972-3851, E: Lakin.Matthew@epa.gov

-----Kurt Malone <kmalone@baaqmd.gov> wrote: -----

To: Matthew Lakin/R9/USEPA/US@EPA

From: Kurt Malone <kmalone@baaqmd.gov>

Date: 05/11/2012 03:45PM

Subject: Annual Plan - memo and Atchmnts - suggestions

Hi Matt -

I am trying to heed your guidance regarding the Bay Area AQMD Annual Network Plan. I don't have any time to do a major revision, of course. I have found your guidance on minimum monitoring requirements to be quite detailed, thanks. I have some suggestions regarding Attachment A.

For ozone, I think the table should say "SLAMS" monitors explicitly – as it does for PM2.5. 40 CFR seems to specifically say "SLAMS".

For your Table 2b, PM2.5 continuous – I see no need to enter design values as they are already listed in Table 2a. Because continuous monitoring is based, for the most part, on the number of SLAMS PM2.5 monitors, it seems to me that the table should only include the information needed to discern the minimum requirement, which is the number of SLAMS PM2.5 monitors (one-half, round up).

Kurt Malone

Supervising Air Quality Meteorologist

Bay Area Air Quality Management District

415-749-4665